UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/129,308	08/05/1998	JAMES R. WHITLEDGE	98.442	4322

20306 7590 06/27/2002

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3200
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/129,308	WHITLEDGE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 April 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Reconsideration (hereinafter the Request) filed 4/24/2002, to the original application filed **8/5/1998**. IDS filed 10/13/1998 (paper #2), 3/4/2000 (paper #4), 4/13/2000 (paper #5), 5/23/2000 (paper #6), and 9/28/2000 (paper #7).

2. Claim 1 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

3. Claims 1-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick and Kurz.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spyglass Prism.

5. Claims 8, 18-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spyglass and Madnick.

6. It is to be noted that two independent sets of rejections are applied to Applicant's pending claims.

7. Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Claim 1, 15, 20 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. **The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:**

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

In regard to independent claim 1, the phrases "*a second network device*", and "a third network device" is confusing, vague and indefinite, because it implies a first network device. However, no mention is made of a first network device in claim 1.

Examiner's Note

10. In regard to independent claim 1, the examiner applies a possible interpretation of the phrases "*a second network device*", and "*a third network device*" as the following: "*a network device*" and "*another network device*", respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. **Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick et al. (hereinafter Madnick), U.S. Patent No. 5,913,214 issued June 1999, in view of Kurz, A., Data warehousing within intranet: prototype of a web-based executive information system, IEEE Database and Expert Systems Applications, September 1-2, 1997, pp.627-632.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Madnick teaches:

- a first network incorporating a plurality of network devices (Madnick Figure 6 item 612) connected to a second network with a plurality of network devices (Madnick Figure 6 items 102, 300, 400, also column 4 lines 19-25; compare with claim 1 preamble "*In a first network with a plurality of network devices connected to a second network with a plurality of network devices, a method of content conversion*").

- a Wrapper Generator on a single computer comprising a Data Retriever, fetches a web page from an Internet web site (Madnick Figure 6 items 614, 620, and 612", see also column 9 lines 48-52, 62-67; compare with claim 1 "*receiving a first hypertext electronic document on a second network device on a first network, from a third network device on a second network*").

- a descriptor file customized for interaction and data extraction with a retrieved web page (Madnick column 10 lines 15-25, column 12 lines 5-11, table 2; compare with claim 1 "*creating a document object model from the first hypertext electronic document*").

- a HTML descriptor file containing additional embedded tags, said tags providing extra information to the Wrapper Generator (Madnick column 15 lines 54-65; compare with claim 1 "*extracting one or more selected hypertext elements from the document object model...*").

- using said additional embedded tags, along with the rest of the specification file, for web data extraction and conversion to a result data set (Madnick column 15 lines 60-67, column 16 lines 1-3; compare with claim 1 "*converting one or more extracted hypertext elements...*").

- Madnick does not specifically teach creation of a second hypertext document including converted elements. However, Kurz teaches final HTML output display (Kurz p.629 Presentation layer, also p.631 Figure 4; compare with claim 1 "*creating a second...converted hypertext elements*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the final HTML page presentation to the utilization of the embedded tags and web page data accessing of Madnick,

because of Kurz's taught advantage of final web display, providing a familiar presentation of data to the returned data sets of Madnick.

- Madnick does not specifically disclose data mining , or a data mining conversion language. However, these two limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Madnick, because Madnick deals with various data extractions (using specialized wrapper generation incorporating specification files), from disparate network sources (i.e. web pages, network databases, etc.) for returning result sets of information, which clearly suggests a data mining embodiment (incorporating a language for its implementation), and providing the advantage of information retrieval from different sources (Madnick column 2 lines 28-43; compare with claim 1 "*...data mining expressions*", and "*data mining conversion language*").

In regard to dependent claim 2, Madnick teaches returning data sets to a Data Receiver (Madnick Figure 6 items 102, 400; compare with claim 2).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Madnick teaches a CD-ROM embodying Madnick's invention (Madnick column 16 lines 17-21; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Madnick does not specifically teach saving references to a symbol table. However, Kurz utilizes parsing and identification of tokens, along with regular expressions using LEX and YACC, which strongly suggests a text compiler which uses symbol tables (Kurz p.163 item 3.1.1, p.164 Table 1; compare with claim 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Kurz to Madnick, because of Kurz's taught advantage of compiler strategy using symbol tables, providing parsing capabilities to Madnick..

In regard to dependent claim 5, Madnick teaches saving elements in a specification file (Madnick column 12 Table 2; compare with claim 5).

In regard to dependent claim 6, Madnick teaches data extraction from a plurality of web sources (Madnick column 13 lines 26-29; compare with claim 6).

In regard to dependent claim 7, Madnick teaches a specification file as a template (Madnick column 13 lines 34-36; compare with claim 7).

In regard to dependent claim 8, Madnick teaches variables addressed as various symbols (Madnick column 12 Table 2 items 0&, A#; compare with claim 8.

In regard to dependent claims 9, 10, Madnick teaches a Query Converter, Command Transmitter, and Data Retriever utilizing web document servers on the Internet (Madnick Figure 6 items 612, 612", 614; compare with claims 9, 10).

In regard to dependent claim 11, Madnick teaches a specification file declaring TYPE: WEB (Madnick column 12 Table 2, near top of table; compare with claim 11.

In regard to dependent claim 12, Madnick teaches CGI, a form of script (Madnick column 14 lines 28-32; compare with claim 12).

In regard to dependent claims 13, 14, Madnick teaches using additional embedded tags, along with the rest of a specification file, for web data extraction and conversion to a result data set (Madnick column 15 lines 60-67, column 16 lines 1-3). Madnick does not specifically teach creation of a second

hypertext document including converted elements. However, Kurz teaches final HTML output display (Kurz p.629 Presentation layer, also p.631 Figure 4; compare with claims 13, 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the final HTML page presentation to the utilization of the embedded tags and web page data accessing of Madnick, because of Kurz's taught advantage of final web display, providing a familiar presentation of data to the returned data sets of Madnick.

In regard to independent claim 15, Madnick teaches:

- a first network incorporating a plurality of network devices (Madnick Figure 6 item 612) connected to a second network with a plurality of network devices (Madnick Figure 6 items 102, 300, 400, also column 4 lines 19-25; compare with claim 15 preamble "*In a first network with a plurality of network devices connected to a second network with a plurality of network devices, a method of content conversion*").

- a Wrapper Generator on a single computer comprising a Data Retriever, fetches a web page from an Internet web site subsequent to receiving a request from a user (Madnick Figure 6 items 102, 614, 620, and 612", see also column 9 lines 48-52, 62-67; compare with claim 15 "*receiving a request for first hypertext electronic document on a second network device on a first network, from a first network device on the first network*").

- a descriptor file customized for interaction and data extraction with a retrieved web page, a HTML descriptor file containing additional embedded tags, said tags providing extra information to the Wrapper Generator, and utilization of said additional embedded tags, along with the rest of the specification file, for web data extraction and conversion to a result data set (Madnick column 10 lines 15-25, column 12 lines 5-11, column 15 lines 54-65, 60-67, column 16 lines 1-3, table 2; compare with claim 15 "*applying a data mining conversion language....one or more converted hypertext elements*").

- Madnick does not specifically teach creation of a second hypertext document including converted elements. However, Kurz teaches final HTML output display (Kurz p.629 Presentation layer, also p.631 Figure 4; compare with claim 15 "*creating a second...converted hypertext elements*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the final HTML page presentation to the utilization of the embedded tags and web page data accessing of Madnick, because of Kurz's taught advantage of final web display, providing a familiar presentation of data to the returned data sets of Madnick.

- returning data sets to a Data Receiver (Madnick Figure 6 items 102, 400; compare with claim 15 "*sending the second....electronic document*").

- Madnick does not specifically disclose data mining , or a data mining conversion language. However, these two limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Madnick, because Madnick deals with various data extractions (using specialized wrapper generation incorporating specification files), from disparate network sources (i.e. web pages, network databases, etc.) for returning result sets of information, which clearly suggests a data mining embodiment (incorporating a language for its implementation), and providing the advantage of information retrieval from different sources (Madnick column 2 lines 28-43; compare with claim 15 "*...data mining conversion language*").

In regard to dependent claim 16, Madnick teaches a CD-ROM embodying Madnick's invention (Madnick column 16 lines 17-21; compare with claim 16).

In regard to dependent claim 17, Madnick teaches a Query Converter, Command Transmitter, and Data Retriever for fetching pages from a document server on the Internet (Madnick Figure 6 items 612, 612", 614; compare with claim 17).

In regard to dependent claims 18, 19, Madnick teaches variables addressed as various symbols (Madnick column 12 Table 2 items 0&, A#; compare with claims 18, 19.

In regard to independent claim 20, Madnick teaches:

- a Wrapper Generator on a single computer comprising a Data Retriever, fetches a web page from an Internet web site subsequent to receiving a request from a user (Madnick Figure 6 items 102, 614, 620, and 612", see also column 9 lines 48-52, 62-67; compare with claim 20 "*a content converter....conversion language*").

- a descriptor file customized for interaction and data extraction with a retrieved web page, a HTML descriptor file containing additional embedded tags, said tags providing extra information to the Wrapper Generator, and utilization of said additional embedded tags, along with the rest of the specification file, for web data extraction and conversion to a result data set (Madnick column 10 lines 15-25, column 12 lines 5-11, column 15 lines 54-65, 60-67, column 16 lines 1-3, table 2; compare with claim 20 "*a document object model for storing hypertext elements of a first hypertext electronic document*").

- a Wrapper Generator on a single computer (proxy) comprising a Data Retriever, fetches a web page from an Internet web site subsequent to receiving a request from a user (Madnick Figure 6 items 102, 614, 620, and 612", see also column 9 lines 48-52, 62-67; compare with claim 20 "*a proxy server....electronic documents*").

- Madnick does not specifically teach creation of a second hypertext document including converted elements. However, Kurz teaches final HTML output display (Kurz p.629 Presentation layer, also p.631 Figure 4; compare with claim 20 "*a second hypertext electronic document*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the final HTML page presentation to the utilization of the embedded tags and web page data accessing of Madnick, because of

Kurz's taught advantage of final web display, providing a familiar presentation of data to the returned data sets of Madnick.

- Madnick does not specifically disclose data mining , or a data mining conversion language. However, these two limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Madnick, because Madnick deals with various data extractions (using specialized wrapper generation incorporating specification files), from disparate network sources (i.e. web pages, network databases, etc.) for returning result sets of information, which clearly suggests a data mining embodiment (incorporating a language for its implementation), and providing the advantage of information retrieval from different sources (Madnick column 2 lines 28-43; compare with claim 20 "data mining conversion expressions", and "*...data mining conversion language*").

13. **Claims 1-7, 9-17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spyglass Prism Concepts And Applications (hereinafter Spyglass Prism), 1997 Spyglass, Inc. pp. 1-7, with a public knowledge date of at least March 10, 1997, as evidenced by Newsflash: "Spyglass Prism Content Conversion Solution Debuted at Embedded Systems East '97", Spyglass Inc., retrieved 5/24/2000, pp. 1-3, <url:http://www.spyglass.com/newsflash/releases/97/031097prism.html>.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Spyglass Prism teaches:

- network devices connected (via a first network) to a Spyglass Prism proxy server, which is in turn connected to the Internet (via a second network), for content conversion of fetched Web pages by said proxy server (Spyglass Prism p. 2, second paragraph from top, also Figure at middle of page; compare with claim 1 preamble "*In a first network....comprising the following steps*", and "*receiving a first hypertext document....network device on a second network*").

- conversion of a Web document via the use of a model utilizing a set of conversion rules specifically designed to convert said document within the limitations set forth by a user's portable network device (i.e. PDA) (Spyglass Prism p. 5 section Content Converter and Cache; compare with claim 1 "*creating a document object model from the first hypertext electronic document*").

- extraction of various hypertext tags for deletion or replacement (conversion) with other tags resulting in a new document suitable for display within said user's portable network device (Spyglass Prism pp. 5-6 section Content Converter and Cache; compare with claim 1 "*extracting one or more....conversion language*", also "*converting one or more extracted....conversion language*", and "*creating a second hypertext electronic document....hypertext elements.*").

- Spyglass Prism does not specifically teach "data mining expressions", and a "data mining conversion language". However, these limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Spyglass Prism, because Spyglass Prism teaches applying conversion rules via a conversion script, as applied to a Web page for converting tags in said Web page, suggesting the mining of a page with a script in order to find, extract, and replace various target tags, providing the advantage of an automated conversion script to Spyglass Prism (Spyglass Prism p.5 second paragraph from top; compare with claim 1 "*data mining expressions*", and "*data mining conversion language*").

In regard to dependent claims 2-3, Spyglass Prism teaches:

- sending a converted (second) Web page to a portable network device (Spyglass Prism p. 2 middle Figure; compare with claim 2).

- a computer readable medium (i.e. a hard drive) for implementing Spyglass Prism's proxy server is known in the computer art (compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claims 4-6, Spyglass Prism teaches:

- referencing elements via the use of conversion rules, said rules stored and manipulated by Device and User database tables (Spyglass Prism p. 6 section Administration and Logging (near bottom); compare with claim 4).

- utilizing said conversion rules and tag extraction as specifically applied to hypertext Web documents, which incorporate tags in hierarchical based layouts (Spyglass Prism p. 5 section Content Converter and Cache; compare with claims 5, 6).

In regard to dependent claim 7, Spyglass Prism does not specifically teach a template. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Spyglass Prism, because Spyglass Prism teaches user device customized conversion rules using a script as applied to an original Web page document, suggesting the use of a template to hold various said rules, etc., providing Spyglass Prism with the advantage of structure that templates provide (Spyglass Prism p. 5 section Content Converter and Cache, p.6 section Administration and Logging; compare with claim 7).

In regard to dependent claims 9-11, Spyglass Prism teaches a content converter, and a document (Internet) server. Spyglass Prism also teaches obtaining elements with hypertext tags (Spyglass Prism p. 2 middle figure, also p. 5 section Content Converter and Cache; compare with claims 9-11).

The use of object oriented techniques for implementing the invention of Spyglass Prism is known in the computer software art.

In regard to dependent claim 12, claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 13, Spyglass Prism teaches conversion of elements from an original document into a converted document (Spyglass Prism p. 5 section Content Converter and Cache; compare with claim 13).

In regard to dependent claim 14, claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 7 and 13, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 15, Spyglass Prism teaches:

- network devices connected (via a first network) to a Spyglass Prism proxy server, which is in turn connected to the Internet (via a second network), for content conversion of fetched Web pages by said proxy server as requested by a user device (Spyglass Prism p. 2, second paragraph from top, also Figure at middle of page; compare with claim 15 preamble "*In a first network....comprising the following steps*", "*receiving a request for first hypertext electronic....network device on the first network*", and "*obtaining the first hypertext....second network device*").

- conversion of a Web page via extraction of various hypertext tags for deletion or replacement (conversion) with other tags, utilizing a set of conversion rules specifically designed to convert said document within the limitations set forth by a user's portable network device (i.e. PDA), resulting in a new document suitable for display within said user's portable network device (Spyglass Prism pp. 5-6 section Content Converter and Cache; compare with claim 15 "*applying a ....converted hypertext documents*", also "*creating a second hypertext electronic document....hypertext elements.*", and "*sending the second....the first hypertext electronic document.*").

- Spyglass Prism does not specifically teach a "data mining conversion language". However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Spyglass Prism, because Spyglass Prism teaches applying conversion rules via a conversion script, as applied to a Web page for converting tags in said Web page, suggesting the mining of a page with a script

in order to find, extract, and replace various target tags, providing the advantage of an automated conversion script to Spyglass Prism (Spyglass Prism p.5 second paragraph from top; compare with claim 15 "*data mining conversion language*").

In regard to dependent claim 16, claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 17, Spyglass Prism teaches a portable network device, a content converter proxy, and a document server (Internet) (Spyglass Prism p. 2 middle figure; compare with claim 17).

In regard to independent claim 20, claim 20 reflects the system comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

14. **Claims 8, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spyglass Prism as applied to claims 1, 15, above, and further in view of Madnick et al. (hereinafter Madnick), U.S. Patent No. 5,913,214 issued June 1999.**

In regard to dependent claims 8, 18-19, Spyglass Prism does not specifically teach the use of prefixes "&%". However, Madnick teaches variables addressed as various symbols (Madnick column 12 Table 2 items 0&, A#; compare with claims 8, 18, 19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Madnick to Spyglass Prism, providing Spyglass Prism an organized way to track various variables of interest via the use of "&" and "%".

15. **Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.**

Papierniak et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,151,601 issued 11/2000

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 4/24/2002 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the first set of rejections (Madnick in view of Kurz), Applicant argues on page 2 of the Request that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness, because the asserted references are not properly combinable. Applicant also argues that the asserted combination of references have no utility and therefore no desirability. The Examiner notes that the patent examination process includes the test of utility, therefore, the Madnick patent has patentable utility. Since Kurz discusses a prototype of a Web-based information system, Kurz has patentable utility, with results displayed in a Web browser (Kurz Figure 4). Kurz teaches practical and desirable results in the form of a result page utilizing OLAP functionality.

As noted in the rejections, Madnick does not specifically teach creation of a second hypertext document including converted elements. The Examiner uses Kurz's teaching of a final HTML output display, to teach this limitation. In additional support to the present rejections, Madnick teaches extracting data from semi-structured data sources, and returning said data to a requestor (Madnick column 2 lines 40-41). Madnick also teaches a data receiver comprising a computer with a display (Madnick column 3 lines 60-67 to column 4 lines 1-8). A data retriever receives Web pages, extracts requested data from said pages, and subsequently returns the data to the data receiver (Madnick column 10 lines 1-5). The Examiner applies Kurz's result page of information gathered using online analytical processing methods, to Madnick's returned data, providing a user of Madnick's data receiver the benefit of display using a familiar medium. Both references utilize various networks, including the Internet.

Applicant argues on pages 3-4, and top of page 6 of the Request that the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness, and that Spyglass Prism does not teach content extraction. Applicant also argues from page 3 bottom, to page 4 of the Request, that Spyglass Prism does not teach data mining, a data mining conversion language, and creation of a document object model from the first electronic document. The Examiner notes that a prima facie case has been made. Spyglass Prism teaches conversion of Web pages into pages suitable for appliances with limited display. Following a conversion routine, content of a page (i.e. various tags) are removed (Spyglass Prism page 5 at bottom). The searching of specific content within a page suggests data mining for various content. Without further clarification of a "*data mining conversion language*". In additional support of the current rejections, Spyglass Prism teaches a Content Converter and Cache, said converter utilizing a set of conversion rules and scripts that define how Web content will be translated (converted) to provide optimal viewing on a requesting device (Spyglass Prism page 5 at middle). The set of rules and scripts, along with said Content Converter, suggests both a data mining conversion language, data mining expressions, and teaches a document object model. Applicant argues that the cited portion of Spyglass Prism (second paragraph of Spyglass Prism page 5) doers not teach content of a Web page may be converted by content extraction, or by removing specific desired hypertext elements relating to data that the user selects for viewing. The Examiner notes that Spyglass Prism teaches removing element tags (i.e. table tags), therefore modifying the content by removing the displayed table.

Applicant argues on pages 5-6 of the Request that Spyglass Prism and Madnick are not properly combinable, and there is no suggestion and/or motivation to combine references. The Examiner notes that Spyglass Prism and Madnick are properly combinable. Madnick teaches variables addressed as various symbols. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Madnick to Spyglass Prism, providing Spyglass Prism an organized way to track various variables of interest via the use of "&" and "%".

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on **(703) 308-5186**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

19. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

William L. Bashore
06/24/2002

JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER